

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-12, 15-24, 26-35, and 38-49 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated December 17, 2007, claims 1, 3-12, 15-24, 26-35, and 38-49 were rejected. Applicants are amending claims 1, 24, and 47, and adding claims 50 and 51 in this Amendment and Response. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Statement of Substance of Interview

On January 23, 2008, Applicant's representative Nikhil Iyengar and Examiner Michael Le discussed the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection and the Rivette reference. Examiner suggested amendments to the claims, including a suggestion that claim 1 be amended to specify that the terms occur within the articles in the first result set. The claims have been amended herein in accordance with Examiner's suggestions, as explained below.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)

In the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, 15-24, 26-35, 38-49 under 35 USC § 103(a). Claims 1, 3-12, 15-16, 18, 20-24, 26-35, 38-39, 41, 43-46, and 48-49 were rejected over U.S. Publication No. 2005/0033803 to Vleet, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,806,079 to Rivette. Claims 17 and 40 were rejected over Vleet in view of Rivette and U.S. Patent No. 5,765,172 to Fox. Claims 19 and 42 were rejected over Vleet in view of Rivette and U.S. Patent No. 6,170,014 to Darago. Claim 47 was rejected over Vleet in view of Rivette, Fox, and Darago. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 recites a method comprising:

providing a data store of stored events, wherein the events comprise data describing user interactions with articles, wherein the articles are associated with a plurality of different applications;
providing an index of the stored events, wherein the index is a part of the data store;
identifying a desired portion of the data store for replication, the identifying comprising:
 identifying a first result set of articles relevant to a search query;
 identifying frequently occurring terms within the articles in the first result set;
 identifying a second result set of articles based at least in part on the frequently occurring terms;
 identifying stored events associated with the articles in the second result set for replication; and
 identifying a portion of the index associated with the identified stored events for replication;
replicating the desired portion of the data store; and
storing the replicated portion on a storage medium.
(emphasis added)

As can be seen, the claim recites providing a data store of stored events that includes an index of the stored events. Events comprise data describing user interactions with articles. A desired portion of the data store is identified for replication, and this portion is replicated and stored. A first result set of articles relevant to a search query is identified, then frequently occurring terms within the articles in that result set are identified, and then a second result set is identified based at least in part on those frequently occurring terms. For example, a search query may be a keyword search for “New York” and “9-11-01” that returns a first result set of articles containing those terms. Additional terms such as “twin towers,” “terrorists,” and “World Trade Center,” may be identified as occurring frequently within articles in this first result set. A second result set of articles can then be found by performing a keyword search on these additional terms.

The claimed invention beneficially enables identifying a desired portion of a data store for replication that includes events associated with articles relevant to a search query, where the results of the search query are extended beyond the query. Support in the specification is found, for example, in paragraph [0036].

Claims 24 and 47, as amended, contain language similar to claim 1 and all arguments presented below regarding claim 1 equally apply to claims 24 and 47.

Claim 1 is not obvious over Vleet and Rivette. Vleet discloses a system for storing event data reflective of events that occur during browsing sessions of web site users. Rivette discloses a system of manipulating notes linked to data objects and replicating a part of a notes database. However, neither Vleet nor Rivette discloses identifying a desired portion of a data store for replication that includes events associated with articles in the second result set as recited in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, the references do not disclose “identifying frequently occurring terms within the articles in the first result set.” This element is discussed in the Claim Rejections and Response to Arguments sections of the Office Action. Examiner cites col. 12, lines 24-27 and col. 21, lines 26-29 of Rivette, which disclose that multiple sub-notes can be linked to the same portion of a data object and that a user can search for sub-notes. Examiner interprets sub-notes as “frequently occurring terms” because, according to the Examiner, there can be multiple sub-notes linked to a single data object, allowing a user to search for sub-notes to determine the most frequently accessed data object. However, Examiner’s interpretation, even if valid, does not explain why determining the most frequently accessed data object discloses “identifying frequently occurring terms,” particularly when Examiner is interpreting sub-notes, rather than the

data object, as the terms. Additionally, the cited portions do not disclose the terms being “within the articles.”

Examiner additionally cites Fox and Darago in rejecting claim 47. Fox discloses the use of a checksum to verify the integrity of a replicated database. Darago discloses a system for managing courseware in a shared use operating environment. These references do not remedy the deficiencies of Vleet and Rivette with respect to the arguments above. They are not concerned with identifying a second result set of articles based on frequently occurring terms within articles in a first result set.

Based on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons a person of ordinary skill in the art would not find invention as defined in claims 1, 24, and 47 to be obvious over the cited references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejections and withdraw them. As to dependent claims, because claims 3-12, 15-23, 26-35, 38-46, and 48-49 variously depend on claims 1 and 24, all arguments advanced above with respect to claims 1, 24, and 47 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to these dependent claims. Applicant disagrees with Examiner’s contention that the dependent claims are obvious over Vleet and Rivette but asserts that they are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims 1 and 24.

Claims 17 and 40 recite “determining a checksum associated with the index and the repository.” Examiner additionally cites Fox in rejecting claims 17 and 40. Fox does not remedy the deficiencies of the other references for the reasons presented above. Claims 19 and 42 recite that “replicating the structure and content of the desired portion of the data store comprises indicating a read-only status.” Examiner additionally cites Darago in rejecting claims

19 and 42. Darago does not remedy the deficiencies of the other references for the reasons presented above.

Applicant has added new claims 50-51. Applicant asserts that these claims are supported by the specification and are not anticipated or obvious in view of Vleet, Rivette, Fox, or Darago. Applicant invites Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
MIHAI FLORIN IONESCU

Date: March 17, 2008

By: /Nikhil Iyengar/

Nikhil Iyengar
Registration No. 60,910
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (415) 875-2367
Fax: (650) 938-5200